

The REAL reason why the US invaded Iraq!

[Post Reply](#) [Post Reply](#)

[Page](#)

4

<1 23456 16>

[Author](#)   [Message](#)   [Topic Rating](#)   [Rate Topic](#)   [Topic Search](#)   [Topic Search](#)   [Topic Options](#)  
[Topic Options](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623

[Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#)   [Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote](#)   [Post Reply](#)[Reply](#)[Direct Link To This Post](#)   Posted: 11 April 2007 at 2:09pm

Originally posted by nu001 nu001 wrote:

Doesn't make sense, How can you say that it's Iran and not SA, Egypt, Jordan or you?

At the moment; there is all the reason to believe that Iran is on the right side.

Others (SA, Egypt, Jordan etc) are openly on US side. So There is no chance to be on the right side, if you are with them.

Who said anything about supporting Saudi Arabia and Egypt or Jordan. Incase you didnt know, Iran is allied to these countries, so I dont know why you imply that these are two different sides.

And also, the Ayah applies to Sadr's so called "Mahdi Army" because it mentions the HYPOCRITES who seem like they want to fight and do Jihad, but they dont and instead they "wait". This is EXACTLY what Sadr has been doing.

The Ayah also says that these people would be helping the Kuffar and protecting them, and again as I have explained on my earlier posts, the "mahdi army" have been protecting occupation forces in Basrah and stabbing the Sunni resistance in the back.

Here is a video of Sadr where he confesses that his forces are to fight alongside the National Guards and Police force of the "new iraqi government" (which is set up, trained and funded by US forces):

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MpTjjs7n0Rw>

[Back to Top](#)

[Sponsored Links](#)

[Back to Top](#)

[mariyah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 29 March 2006

Status: Offline

Points: 1283      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0)   [Quote mariyah](#) [Quote](#)   [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)  
Posted: 12 April 2007 at 3:21am

Originally posted by Daniel Dworsky Daniel Dworsky wrote:

Hallooo Germany!!!

The 'problem' is when Zionism comes at the expense of the Palestinian people. Israel is nice but I think that after the war we should have gotten a nice chunk (if not all) of the Rhineland. Cheap shot - I know. I'm just teasing! Hows the peace business going?  
Hiel Bush...

"Every good deed is charity whether you come to your brother's assistance or just greet him with a smile.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) Posted: 28 May 2007 at 3:13pm

Bismillahirrahmaanerrahem

Here is more confirmation of what I've been saying on this thread:

[http://www.jamestown.org/news\\_details.php?news\\_id=245](http://www.jamestown.org/news_details.php?news_id=245)

Here are some key points in this article:

Originally posted by wrote:

As splintered political factions, such as the Sadrists, seek to form a new coalition made up of Sunni parties, formerly exiled Shiite groups like Da'wa and the SIIC are facing new challenges in maintaining a dominant political bloc in Baghdad. Moqtada al-Sadr's call to create a "reform and reconciliation project," which would also include Sunnis, is a radical departure from his sectarian base which was formed with the United Iraqi Alliance (UIA) and under the spiritual leadership of Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani in 2004

Notice it says Sadr wants to include Sunnis in the Government if he gains power in Iraq. Remember that I said that Sadr is there to deceive and fool the Sunni Muslims by becoming the "saviour" of Iraq.

Originally posted by wrote:

On entering Iraq after more than 20 years of exile in Iran in 2003, al-Hakim witnessed the rise of a major Shiite political rival, a young cleric named Moqtada al-Sadr, who would publicly question his bravery and Iraqi credentials for not only failing to stand up to Saddam, but also for being a foreign agent backed by the Iranian government.

But now Sadr is trying to pretend to be a "nationalist" and even an opponent of Iran!!! Even though it is a proven fact that Sadr has been armed and funded by the Iranian Government.

Sadr is trying to appear as a nationalist since many Iraqis have realised that Iran has been helping the Occupation forces by sending death squads such as the Badr brigade to Iraq and by openly supporting the New Iraqi Government that was made by the United States.

So why is Iran funding and supporting both the "Mahdi army" led by Muqtada al-Sadr, AND the new Iraqi Government and its death squads including the Badr brigade???

The reason is given by Allah in the holy Qur'an:

Those who wait for (some misfortune to befall) you then If you have a victory from Allah they say: Were we not with you? And if the disbelievers gain success, they say: Did we not acquire the mastery over you and defend you from the believers?

So Allah shall Judge between you on the day of resurrection, and Allah will by no means give the unbelievers a way against the believers.

(Qur'an: Surah Nisa: 141)

Allah tells us that the Monafiqeen (hypocrites) have TWO plans:

1: Those who wait for (some misfortune to befall) you then If you have a victory from Allah they say: Were we not with you?

2: And if the disbelievers gain success, they say: Did we not acquire the mastery over you and defend you from the believers?

The Iranian Government are Monafiq (hypocrites) and that is why they have EXACTLY the two plans - which is why they are supporting both Sadr and the "New Iraqi Government".

If the resistance win, Sadr is going to come up and claim that he was part of the resistance and helping the Sunnis, so that he can gain power and deceive the true Muslims (Sunnis). He would call for "unity" and claim he has nothing against Sunnis (even though his group have been assassinating Sunni Mujahideen and even secretly helping the occupation as I've proven on my earlier posts on this thread).

And if the Occupation forces manage to destroy the Sunni resistance now, the New Iraqi Government and Badr brigade will continue ruling over Iraq and Sadr would then say to them: Did we not acquire the mastery over you and defend you from the believers? (Remember that as I've mentioned on my first post on this thread, it was reported that Sadr's forces were DEFENDING occupation forces in southern Iraq from the Sunni resistance!!!).

Remember that both Sadr and the new Iraqi Government are Shiah's. They have the

same ideology as Iran, they are both supported, funded and armed by Iran. The reason why they seem to have very different plans is that Iran is trying to create a win-win situation so that if the resistance are defeated, Shiah would control Iraq, and if the resistance win, again Shiah would take over Iraq (both Shiah groups having the same ideology as the Shiah Iranian Government!)

So these are their two plans. These two plans are the plans of the Monafiqeen, the hypocrites. These are the two plans of the Iranian Government and the Illuminati who control the Shiah Mullahs.

The original plan was that there would be absolutely no significant Sunni resistance. This plan failed due to Sunni and Salafi groups such as Tawhid Wal-Jihad, Islamic Army of Iraq and Ansar Sunnah.

When this happened, the planners (Iran, USA, France and other Illuminati Governments) had two choices left... and those are the two I've mentioned above (which Allah subahana Ta'ala foretold in the holy Qur'an).

Edited by Sawtul Khilafah

[Back to Top](#)

[Sign\\*](#)[Reader View](#) [Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 02 November 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 3352

[Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Sign\*Reader Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post  
Posted: 28 May 2007 at 8:17pm

Sawtul Khilafah

Senior Member

Senior%20Member

ASA/786

After all the yelling you received from other members here, what you have noted in your neighborhood, seems on the money. The problem with Muslims i.e., the Sunnies has been their flawed politically correct approach for longest period. The Shiits have been working all along with the colonial administrations in most countries and have ended up in control while the sunnies who were the original rulers of the colonial territories were kept outside by design.

In my personal experience have found them quite experts in duplicity and sycophancy to take advantage of situations. In US they were in the forefront to sponsor Bush's campaign for what ever gains they were looking for.

Being a very small minorities, figure what happened in two very important areas like Syria and Pakistan.

Edited by Sign\*Reader - 23 March 2010 at 5:01pm

Back to Top

Duende View Drop Down

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 27 July 2005

Status: Offline

Points: 651 Post Options Post Options

Thanks (0) Thanks(0) Quote Duende Quote Post ReplyReplyDirect Link To This Post  
Posted: 29 May 2007 at 11:31am

It's easy to cave in to Sawtul's hate-filled conspiracy theories. His hatred

for Iran and Shiites is well recorded and totally blinds him from considering anything NOT motivated by similar sentiments as his own.

Even I can see he has a point referring to Iran as the Monafiq, but it would be very short sighted indeed to assume that all Shia were driven by some inexplicable desire to unite with Iran. To believe the similarity of ideology makes for some Pan-Arab Shia nation is politically naïve.

It's at times like these the spectre of Sawtul's early lies about his provenance and whereabouts add to the confusion: why does he still proclaim to be in Iran? And if he's Iranian why does he show such ignorance of the myriad political manoeuvres behind the scenes? What does he know of the Hawza?

Sadr is more politically motivated than religious. He is not as highly regarded in this sphere as Sistani, about whom we hear nothing from Sawtul and his anti-Shia ravings. Isn't it also possible that Iran is more politically motivated (certainly more than any humanitarian concerns) in its shady manipulation of various players?

There is no way America is in secret collusion with Iran, who see (rightly so) The Great Satan as its enduring enemy, and the Little Satan (the UK) as its historical enemy. They do not want to see either manifestations of evil on their doorstep, neither do they want to see any hand maidens of the Satan in charge of Iraq. America is the far greater hypocrites, simply biding time before they put in place their preference: Alawi, who will happily oversee the so-called hydrocarbon law everything hinges on.

The Americans are waiting for the internal splits between the various Shia

factions to begin to manifest themselves. There has never been any plan, guided by Illuminati or involving French governments or anybody else.

What's going on now was impossible to plan, but the outcome the U.S wants is far from the outcome the Iranians want. Both of them are interested in the same thing, when it comes down to it: Iraqi oil deposits, Iranian fields are in decline, therefore Iranian income and geopolitical position is under threat.

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) [Posted: 31 May 2007 at 1:09pm](#)

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

It's easy to cave in to Sawtul's hate-filled conspiracy theories.

When I say something will happen and it happens, it's no longer a "conspiracy theory", it's a conspiracy Fact (remember the "hezbollah or hezbushaytan?" thread).

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

Even I can see he has a point referring to Iran as the Monafiq, but it would

be very short sighted indeed to assume that all Shia were driven by some inexplicable desire to unite with Iran. To believe the similarity of ideology makes for some Pan-Arab Shia nation is politically naïve.

I didnt say all Shias, but these famous Shia groups that are being funded by Iran ("Hezbollah" "Mahdi Army" and "Badr brigade"). It's obvious that groups who are being funded and armed by Iran and some of whose members are Iranians are willing to unite with Iran. It's common sense.

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

It's at times like these the spectre of Sawtul's early lies about his provenance and whereabouts add to the confusion:

I Never lied to anyone, but I deliberately didnt fill in my profile properly as I didnt want to be identified (as I've already explained so many times before).

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

And if he's Iranian why does he show such ignorance of the myriad political manouvers behind the scenes? What does he know of the Hawza?



I know about the Hawzas of Iran/Qum and Iraq but I simply dont think that America's invasion of Iraq has anything to do with the minor differences between the Hawzas.

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

Sadr is more politically motivated than religious. He is not as highly regarded in this sphere as Sistani, about whom we hear nothing from Sawtul and his anti-Shia ravings.

Read my first post on this thread, I DID write about Sistani!

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

There is no way America is in secret collusion with Iran, who see (rightly so) The Great Satan as its enduring enemy, and the Little Satan (the UK) as its historical enemy. They do not want to see either manifestations of evil on their doorstep, neither do they want to see any hand maidens of the Satan in charge of Iraq. America is the far greater hypocrites, simply biding time before they put in place their preference: Alawi, who will happily oversee the so-called hydrocarbon law everything hinges on.

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=8744&;PN=3](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=8744&;PN=3) (Iran's reverse psychology) and [http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=8924&;PN=2](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=8924&;PN=2)

As for Allawi, he's long gone and I've explained the reason on the first post on this thread. When the Sunni resistance appeared Sadr had to stay back and when the Occupation forces and puppet Government were in trouble, they needed Sadr's help and in order for Sadr to have an excuse to help them they had to replace Allawi with "religious" Shias. But both the "religious" and Allawi are puppets/agents of the Occupation forces and wouldnt last a day without their protection and funding.

Originally posted by Duende Duende wrote:

There has never been any plan,  
guided by Illuminati or involving French governments or anybody else.

Whats going on now was impossible to plan,

Incase you didnt read my posts, I said their original plan FAILED, though they are still trying to go for a similar plan which is for Sadr to unite with Sunni resistance groups

(and since Sadr has a huge army, which were left unharmed by the occupation, he would eventually take over Iraq when the occupation forces leave, if the Sunni resistance foolishly agree to unite with him).

Edited by Sawtul Khilafah

[Back to Top](#)

[Sawtul Khilafah View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Avatar

Joined: 20 July 2006

Location: Peru

Status: Offline

Points: 623      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

[Thanks \(0\)](#) [Thanks\(0\)](#) [Quote Sawtul Khilafah](#) [Quote](#) [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#) Posted: 10 October 2007 at 6:06pm

Bismillahirrahmaanerrraheem

According to Abu Omar Baghdadi, the leader of one of the biggest anti-occupation Jihadist groups in Iraq, some of the insurgents (mainly the nationalists and those who have good relations with puppet Arab Governments) have agreed to change sides and actually help the occupation forces and their allies fight the Sunni "extremists", and in return the Americans have promised to help them fight the Shiah "Mahdi Army" of Moqtada al-Sadr.

This is very interseting for two reasons. First of all, this shows that the Americans have so far pretty much avoided fighting the "Mahdi Army"... which confirms what I've been saying on this and other threads (despite the "Mahdi Army" being portrayed as an actual resistance group).

Secondly, this shows that they are actually trying to go back to the original plan which I mentioned on my first post on this thread.

They have told these Sunni insurgents (who are mainly Baathists and nationalists) that if they help America destroy the religious groups (such as al-Qaeda and Ansaar Sunnah) then the Americans would help them fight the Shia "Mahdi Army".

I believe the Occupation forces are actually trying to deceive these insurgents, as this is starting to sound a lot like what I predicted on this thread.

Let's see what happens if the plan works. First, the religious Sunni groups would be destroyed. Then the Americans and those Iraqi insurgents who helped them would team up against the "Mahdi Army"...

Then... as I explained on my first post on this thread, the Americans would have a fake short war with the "Mahdi Army" and other Shias in which they would be "defeated" and would leave Iraq, portraying Sadr and his "Mahdi Army" as the victors and saviours of Iraq.

By then, the Sunni groups would have been divided into two groups:

1) The religious (who by then would be destroyed, so they would not be seen as the defeaters of the occupation)

2) The nationalists (who having joined the occupation, would be seen as traitors and agents of the occupation, so they certainly won't be seen as the victors).

So at that point, the only group that could take credit for "defeating the occupation" would be Moqtada al-Sadr's "Mahdi Army".

As I explained in great detail on my first post on this thread, the original plan was that there would be no significant Sunni resistance.

When this plan failed after the rise of nearly 10 powerful Sunni groups, they decided to destroy them and then have the fake war with the "Mahdi Army". This plan didnt go very well either.

So now they have come up with a new plan which in the end would give the same results they were hoping to get at the beginning of this war, by taking advantage of the rising enmity between the Sunni Nationalists and Sunni Islamists.

[Back to Top](#)

[Tom123 View Drop Down](#)

Senior Member

Senior Member

Joined: 04 July 2007

Location: Gibraltar

Status: Offline

Points: 186      [Post Options](#) [Post Options](#)

Thanks (0) [Thanks\(0\)](#)   [Quote Tom123](#) [Quote](#)   [Post Reply](#)[ReplyDirect](#) [Link To This Post](#)  
Posted: 13 October 2007 at 7:17pm

Originally posted by Sawtul Khilafah Sawtul Khilafah wrote:

Bismillahirrahmaanerrahem

So why did the USA invade Iraq ? Was it for oil ? Or was it a conspiracy similar to the Hezbushaytan conspiracy in Lebanon ?

The US did not invade Iraq for oil. Infact they have spent billions of dollars on this war and the most they could get out of Iraq's oil is to get their money back.

The truth is that just as Israel invaded Lebanon to make Hezbushaytan look like heroes, the US actually invaded Iraq to make Muqtada al-Sadr the hero of Iraq.

This time however, since Saddam's Government was destroyed by the US, Moqtada al-Sadr was actually meant to take over Iraq. This is why we see that the mainstream Media (which is controlled by the same people who control the Governments) spoke against the war and so many controlled oppositions and fake leftists were against this war...

The war on Afghanistan is silenced down by the media and the fake left who lead and set up the main protests pretty much ignore Afghanistan, concentrating almost entirely on Iraq instead.

We also saw how the Abu Ghurayb torture pictures came out and were spread in all the mainstream newspapers and the TV. These are the same newspapers and TV channels who censor 99% of the truth about world events and who cover up much of the crimes of the western Governments. But for some reason everyone suddenly seemed to turn against the Iraq war, including the fat cats and the members of secret societies and even the mainstream media.

We also saw how the US Government accused Iraq of having WMDs, but when they couldn't find any, they actually said so !

This is the same Government who covered up what really happened on 9/11. After the WTC attacks, the US Government immediately blamed the attacks on Al-Qaeda, and after Osama bin Laden denied responsibility for the attacks the Government made numerous fake videos and audio tapes and all sorts of fake evidence to try and convince people that bin Laden was responsible for the attacks.

But again, when it came to Iraq, things were different. The US politicians just came out and admitted that they have found no WMDs, thus deliberately making the war unpopular.

Bush also accused Saddam of involvement in 9/11, but strange he later denied it. But why did he deny it ? If he had lied in the first place, why didn't he continue lying? If he had no evidence in the first place, why didn't he continue lying without any evidence ? Or could it be that he deliberately wants to be seen as a liar, thus making the Iraq war and the US right wing more unpopular.

The truth is that the US knew from day one that Iraq had no WMDs. Even Collin Powell admitted this when he first came to office. And the real question is, why was the US

worried about Iraq's alleged Chemical and Biological bombs, when Iran was allegedly making NUCLEAR bombs ???

Surely Nuclear weapons should be a bigger concern... but strangely the US and the western media only turned their eyes towards Iran AFTER it was made clear to the whole world that Iraq did not have WMDs.

In other words, now that the US accuses Iran of making WMDs no one believes them because they had already lied about Iraq.

But the real question is Why didnt they invade Iran before Iraq ? This is while Iran is SUPPOSEDLY USA's biggest enemy in the middle east, and while Saddam was USA's former ally.

Iran was also a neighbour of Afghanistan, making it easier for the US to move it's forces from Iran to Afghanistan and from Afghanistan to Iran.

Now the media is trying to decieve us into thinking that the US wanted to invade Iran After Iraq... some going as far as claiming that the US wanted to "surround" Iran from the east and the west. This is ridiculous though because it would have been much easier for the US to invade Iran in the first place, or at least right after Afghanistan.

No, the truth is something else. The US didnt invade Iran because they dont even want to invade Iran, and infact, as I have explained on another thread, Iran and USA are secretly working together:

[http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum\\_posts.asp?TID=7785&;PN=1&TPN=1](http://www.islamicity.com/forum/forum_posts.asp?TID=7785&;PN=1&TPN=1)

Now consider that the US and Iran are only pretending to be enemies and then we can think about the real reason why the US invaded Iraq.

If you have a good memory, you may remember that when the US first invaded Iraq, a Shiah cleric by the name of Moqtada al-Sadr showed up, who claimed to have risen up to fight against the invaders and free Iraq.

The media suddenly concentrated on him, even though he and his forces had done

very little and had killed very few if any American soldiers.

Moqtada al-Sadr's army, which he calls "the Mahdi Army", were seen as a serious force to be reckoned with... they were seen to be the "Hizbullah" of Iraq. Infact, they are closely allied to "Hezbollah" (Hezbushaytan) and they constantly praise Hasan Nasrallah.

I have no doubt that Moqtada al-Sadr was meant to be the Nasrallah of Iraq. In other words, the plan was that he would rise up against the US, and the US would then leave all of a sudden. Sadr would then be seen as the hero and saviour of Iraq, and with Saddam gone, he would take over Iraq and eventually hand it over to Iran.

This is why Ayad Allawi was at first installed as the president of Iraq. Although Allawi was born into a Shiah family he was not seen as a Shiah as he did not practice his religion in any way. He was seen as just another US puppet, and this was done to make the US occupation even more unpopular and increase support for Sadr.

This is also why the real number of American soldiers killed is not reported. Ofcourse in most wars Governments try to claim that fewer soldiers have been kill than the enemy claims, however in this war the USA has been minimising the casualty reports like no other. The Army of Rashideen (Jaysharrashedeen, one of the Islamic yet nationalist resistance groups in Iraq) made a documentary where they gave examples of how the US casualties were not reported, and even when the resistance filmed their attacks the mainstream media (and even aljazeera) tried their best not to tell the truth about the number of dead Americans. As an example there was one attack where the Army of Rashideen themselves killed 4 Americans, but the western media and even aljazeera claimed that only 1 soldier was killed !!

The resistance groups such as the Army of Rashideen claim that over 30,000 American soldiers have actually been killed and they see the numbers given by the US Government as a joke. In their documentary film the Army of Rashideen put forward an intresting question. They asked Bush how is he going to cover up so many deaths ? They found this cover up very strange as the US is actually claiming the number of American soldiers killed to be less than 10% than what it really is.

So why is this happening ? And why also does the mainstream media seem to completely ignore Afghanistan and hardly ever report the American casualties there ? Many people in the west are actually under the impression that very little is going on in Afghanistan, this is while American soldiers themselves say that the war in Afghanistan is far more serious and far deadlier than the war in Iraq.

What's happening is again part of the conspiracy. The US Government would eventually have to report the true number of casualties, or at least they would have to reveal more than 10%, but they have planned to do this only after Sadr rises up. In other words they plan that when Sadr rises up they would suddenly claim that 20 or 30 thousand American troops have been killed - supposedly all of them by Sadr's "Mahdi Army". Then when people in the west hear of this there would be an uproar and bigger protests. Bush would then have an excuse to pull out of Iraq, making it seem as if Sadr and his Army have suddenly risen up and gained an amazing victory.

The US would then claim that those American soldiers who were really killed in Afghanistan were actually transferred to Iraq and were killed there by the "mahdi army" ! The tens of thousands of soldiers who have been killed by al-Qaeda, Ansar Sunnah, Army of Rashideen and other Sunni resistance groups would all be attributed to Sadr.

In other words the plan is that Sadr and his army would rise up after the defeat of the Sunni resistance. Then the western Media and the Governments would claim that the "Mahdi Army" have gained amazing victories and have killed thousands of American soldiers in a short while, when in reality there would be very little real fighting.

The US would then pull out of Iraq, supposedly defeated by the Moqtada al-Sadr.

However one thing happened which the US was not predicting, and that was that religious Sunni Muslims formed their own groups which turned out to be far more powerful than Sadr's "Mahdi army", even though the "Mahdi army" had more members.

Ofcourse the US knew very well that Sunnis are going to rise up, what they didn't predict was that they would be so strong and would hold up such a great resistance.

At first the US just tried to destroy these Sunni "insurgents" but their own forces suffered instead. The conspirators who had planned these wars were now terrified because if these Sunnis managed to defeat the US then they would be seen as the heroes of Iraq and all their plans would be ruined.

So then we saw how the Government of Iraq was changed and made to look more religious and Shiah clerics were included in the Government. The New Iraqi Government then became popular among many Shiahs in Iraq and so more people joined the "Iraqi National Army".

Now the US forces didn't have to worry about the Sunni "insurgents" defeating them, because the National Army were there to take some of the casualties.

In order to encourage more people to join the National Army, the US and the New Iraqi Government bombed civilian areas, murdering men women and children, and then blaming it on the Sunni "insurgents", especially al-Qaeda.

However, even al-Qaeda denied these charges but ofcourse their voice is hardly ever heard. The Shiah clerics such as "Ayatullah" Ali Sistani and even the Iranian Government repeated the lie of the Americans and the New Iraqi Government, accusing so called "Sunni extremists" and al-Qaeda for these attacks on mosques and schools.

Sistani even went as far as calling upon his followers to join the National Army to fight the "terrorists" and so many more people joined the National Army seeking to take "revenge" from the Sunnis "insurgency".

Things were now going well for the conspirators, but the Sunni "insurgents" had taken over some of the key locations in Iraq including Fallujah.

The conspirators wanted to completely destroy the Sunni "insurgents" and they were not willing to take any chances so they bombed Fallujah and other areas controlled by Sunni resistance groups without mercy. They even use illegal Chemical bombs including White Phosphorus. These bombs killed off entire peoples and completely destroyed some areas. Thousands and thousands of Sunni civilians were killed in these bombings which were meant to completely finish off the Sunni resistance and give way to Moqtada al-Sadr's "Mahdi army".

But instead of being annihilated, the "insurgents"/resistance simply went underground, as explained by the leader of Jaysh ar-Raashideen (one of the main resistance groups). He stated that afterwards the resistance became even stronger and harder to fight because now the US didn't know where they are while the resistance knew where the Americans are.

And so the Sunni resistance continued and Sadr was forced to tell his forces to stop fighting the Americans, and this is why: If you study what Moqtada al-Sadr has been doing, u will see that he has been constantly calling upon his followers to stop fighting the occupation. Every time his forces go into a battle with the Americans or the British or the Government, he immediately calls for a ceasefire.

Most of his followers have no idea what is going on. He is actually telling them to stop fighting because he wants the Americans to get rid of the Sunni resistance first. When their job is done, he is meant to come out and play the part of the hero.

However it was not enough for him to convince his followers not to fight the occupation, he even went as far as calling upon his followers to help the occupation!!! This he claimed was to fight against the "bigger enemy" which was al-Qaeda !!! This was because now the Government was handed over to religious Shiah, so Sadr could claim that he is defending "Muslims" from "Nasibis" ("Nasibi" is a term Shiahs use against Sunnis whenever they want to fight against them).

The "Mahdi Army" then teamed up with the Iraqi National Army, fighting against the Sunni resistance groups !! They even protected the British forces in Basrah as reported by Peter Osborne in his documentary (Iraq Reckoning).

So what kind of "resistance force" are they ??? If you look at what these guys have been up to for the past 3 or 4 years, you will be amazed to see that the mainstream media still tries to portray them as an "insurgency" and how Moqtada al-Sadr still talks big as if he is USA's main enemy, when in reality he has been helping the occupation.

Strangely, Moqtada al-Sadr can't decide whether he supports the New Iraqi Government or not. One day he joins his forces with them, the next day he talks big about bringing down the Government.

The reason why he looks so stupid now is that he has been waiting for too long, and this is because the Americans have failed to destroy the Sunni resistance. He is meant to be an anti-Government anti-occupation religious hero, but his actions have proven the opposite.

He is still lying in wait for the time when his illuminati/Rosicrucian masters tell him to rise up against the occupation. Now that a religious Shiah government has been installed in Iraq part of the plan is already accomplished, except that the conspirators didn't want shiahs to look like American puppets, which is why they have kept Sadr.

But just incase the Sunni resistance continues to stand tall, they are going to have to stay content with a pro-American, yet "religious" Shiah Government (So long as Iran is allied to them, and so long as Iran is seen as a religious anti-American Government, the New Iraqi Government could also hope to be portrayed as anti-American one day. In other words they can later pretend to have sided with Iran rather than the USA, when in reality they have always been working with both Iran and the USA).

During the past few years many Sunni resistance groups have grown suspicious of Sadr. Some have even found proof that his men were working secretly with the Americans. No not just Al-Qaeda, but other Sunni resistance groups like Ansar-Sunnah and Jaysha Abi Bakr have arrested and executed close friends of Moqtada al-Sadr and high ranks in the "Mahdi Army", who were seen working closely with the Americans.

Also the leader of the Islamic Army of Iraq stated in an interview with al-Jazeera that the "Mahdi Army" should decide which side they are on (as they are sometimes working with the occupation).

The Ansar Sunnah also made a documentary film where they showed how the Americans attacked certain areas, destroyed every single household, except the Shiah ones.

In one particular village, there was one Shiah family living among many Sunni families. All Sunni families in that area were killed off by the Americans, but the Shiah family and their house were left untouched!! The Americans are obviously working for the same people who control Sadr, which is why they are ordered to destroy the Sunni population of Iraq thus increasing the Shiah percentage and thus giving the majority of Iraqis only two choices: New Iraqi Government or Sadr.

Recently Sadr has been trying to win over support by pretending to be a nationalist and thus portraying himself as an opponent of Iran !!! Nothing can be further from the truth. Most if not all of Sadr's weapons have been given to him by Iran and infact

Iran is even sending men to Iraq to join the "mahdi army" and also the pro-American "Badr brigade". The Sunni resistance group Ansar Sunnah even captured an Iranian member of Sadr's army after fighting and defeating a group of fighters from the "Mahdi army". The Iranian hostage had even been given equipment by Iran and was sent to Iraq by the Iranian Government itself.

As time is passing by the plans of the Kuffar are being exposed, because as Allah Subhana Ta'ala says:

"Although they plan, Allah also plans. And Allah is the Best of Planners." [Holy Qur'an 8:30]

LOL!!! The Americans invaded Iraq to make Sadr look good- and the Israelis invaded Lebanon to help Hizbullah- BRILLIANT!!!!

You should seriously consider publishing this in MAD magazine or some other similar source! The Mahdi Army is not 'pro-American' and the Hizbullah is not 'pro-Israeli'. The fact is Shia Muslim fighters have inflicted more casualties on Israeli and American invading forces in the Middle East than anyone else. Many Sunni armed groups (like Ansar Al Sunnah or Al Qaeda in Iraq) hate the Jaish Al Mahdi because they are Shias and they see the Shia as heretics.

I am not btw a supporter of either the Mahdi Army or Hizbullah or Sunni Iraqi resistance groups, or the American and Iraqi puppet government forces they are battling (when they are not fighting each other).

I believe as a Christian that all war and violence today is against Christ's teachings and therefore I am opposed to it. So I am not 'defending' Sadr or Hizbullah- like the people they are fighting they too have blood of the innocent on their hands.

However, I believe that to accuse Hizbullah or Jaish Al Mahdi of being pro-US or pro-Israeli governments is absurd.

Why do you hate Shias so much? Aren't they Muslims too?

Cristo Vive!

- Tomasz